

United States Patent and Trademark Office

M

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/975,686	10/11/2001	Mila Obradovic	365	9463
2292	7590 11/19/2004		EXAMINER	
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747			ROBINSON, GRETA LEE	
	FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2167	
			DATE MAILED: 11/19/2004	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		09/975,686	OBRADOVIC ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Greta L. Robinson	2167			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address			
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. It is period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be a within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) da will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fro, cause the application to become ABANDON	timely filed ays will be considered timely. m the mailing date of this communication. IED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 Ja	anuary 2004.				
2a) <u></u> □	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This	action is non-final.				
3)[Since this application is in condition for allowa	nce except for formal matters, p	rosecution as to the merits is			
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposit	ion of Claims		. :			
4)⊠	4) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
5)[
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-24</u> is/are rejected.						
7)	7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8)□	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.				
Applicat	ion Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
	10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>11 October 2001</u> is/are: a)□ accepted or b)⊠ objected to by the Examiner:					
<i>,</i> —	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex		:			
Priority ι	under 35 U.S.C. § 119		,			
12)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 H.S.C. & 110/	a) (d) or (f)			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
u),	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.						
	application from the International Bureau		roa in ano ranonarotago			
* 5	See the attached detailed Office action for a list		∕ed.			
		·				
A44	44-1					
Attachmen 1) Notice	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) There is a	(DTO 442)			
	e of Braftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4)				
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)						
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) [_] Other:						

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-24 are pending in the present application.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the "stress-test information database" must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Art Unit: 2167

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Regarding claims 1-24 the following limitation is not described properly in the disclosure "stress-test information database" [note: independent claim 1 line 1; independent claim 13 line 2]. On page 6 lines 8-10, the specification states the following: "The inventive virtual oven system may also utilize an **inventive database**. In particular, **the database invention** includes a **stress-test information database** stored in a computer-readable medium and usable for storing information related to a stress-test of different products ..." It is unclear from the description as to whether the "inventive database" is equivalent to "the database invention" and how this relates to "a stress-test information database". The disclosure appears to state that the database invention encompasses a stress-test information database. Also the drawings do not appear to depict the stress-test database. The disclosure does make reference to the

inventive database 400, see page 30 lines 7-8, and figure 11; but does not appear to equate the stress-test information database to this element.

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claims 1-24 the following limitation is vague: "stress-test information database". It is unclear as to whether the stress-test information database is reference character 400, the inventive database see page 30 lines 7-8 and figure 11.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-24 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. In the response Applicant argued the term "command" in claims 2-5 and 14-17 is not vague. Applicant's comments regarding the meaning of the term are convincing, therefore they rejection under 35 USC 112 second paragraph has been dropped. In view of Applicant's comment regarding prior art references Grey et al. and Eliashberg et al. the rejections cited under 102(e) and 103(a) are overcome, however a new rejection has been made under 35 USC 112 first paragraph note citations supra.

Art Unit: 2167

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Greta L. Robinson whose telephone number is (571) 272-4118. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 9:30AM-6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E. Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Oreta robinson Primary examiner

Greta Robinson Primary Examiner November 16, 2004